

Mr. Philip Cayelin
The Washington Post
1150 15 St., NW
Washington, D.C. 20071

7627 Old Receiver Road
Frederick, Md. 21701
11/29/88

Dear Mr. Cayelin,

"Kennedy and the Revision of History" is fine. I'm glad to see it and thank you for it.

You say, "What Kennedy would have done about Vietnam is Unknowable." I think you are wrong and don't know or forgot what he did do. It should be in the Post's morgue. He had the Pentagon make a re-evaluation of our involvement and just before he was killed the Post carried about a stick of type reporting the release, which said we could begin withdrawing our advisers. A few days after he was killed there was about another stick of type in which the Pentagon is reported as saying that ^{further} re-evaluation disclosed that the earlier statement was optimistic. The rest is known, alas. In about 1967 I interviewed General James Gavin at the ABA annual convention at the Shoreham for a book-and-author radio show. He confirmed that Kennedy had called his generals in and told them that political problems are not susceptible of military solutions and that we were withdrawing. One plane load did get back before he was assassinated. I believe that from this we do know, or can, but don't remember or didn't know because the two statements go so little play.

You also ask, "Why this insistence on trying to give even ^{.....} deeper meaning - well beyond what the available evidence will sustain - to this one, violent, hateful act?" One reason is because the assassination of any president, regardless of what the assassin or assassins intended, has the effect of a coup d'etat.

I suggest also that you do not have the remotest notion of what the "available" evidence is. One reason is because papers like the Post have refused to report it when it became "available" through efforts other than the papers made. By use of FOIA, as I'm sure George Lardner will confirm to you, I've obtained, which frequently meant forced the disclosure of, perhaps a third of a million pages of previously withheld records. Any serious examination of them leaves it beyond question that the crime was never officially investigated and was never intended to be investigated. The sole effort was to make Oswald's lone guilt appear to be credible. I don't want to burden you but I can xerox perhaps a dozen pages of FBI records that will illustrate this plus one I got from the Department.

I believe that these records also leave it beyond reasonable question that the crime was beyond the capability of any one man and thus was the end product of a conspiracy and that had he not been killed Oswald could not have been convicted. If, indeed, tried.

These may appear to be extreme comments to one whose knowledge comes from what the papers carried but I do assure you they are not exaggerations. I suggest that this is a reason for trying to go "deeper," as I have for 25 years in what I think serves the nation's interest. I'm sorry that the papers won't mention any of this or the felonious misconduct of the government to prevent it. This is undeniable in court.

If you think further about Kennedy's presidency and the revisionists, I suggest you'll find it was a quite different presidency after the Cuba missile crisis. I had intended this to be my third book and had it researched. When I could not get to it I let a then college student have much of it, including these two brief stories, for a thesis he was writing. I'm sure he'll remember it. He is now general counsel for Lucas films. His name is Howard Roffman. After law school he was clerk to a federal appeals court judge in Florida.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

Harold Weisberg